Not having your promised reply to my letter of April 7, which I believe has to do with my initial request of more than four months ago, I do not know what your response is or will be. However, based on the record you have conveniently made so clear, I think it not unreasonable to anticipate a denial. Therefore, I ask you to send me the papers and any necessary instructions for asking for this under the "Freedom of Information" Act. I want to be in a proper position to carry this through, and to exhaust all the administrative possibilities.

You write, "The two pages bearing 'notes actually made in the room in which the examination was taking place' that are mentioned in Dr. Humes' testimony here reproduced in XVIII hearings 68-86." This cannot be the case, unless Dr. Humes perjured himself. He testified to his notes, made in the autopsy room by "myself", during the autopsy. These are not his. One is by Dr. Boswell, the other by Dr. Finck. It is not only reasonable to assume that Dr. Humes could not make an autopsy without notes, it is also his sworn testimony. The files you have made available to me contain no such notes. You do have the receipts for those very notes, from the autopsy bench to the Commission. If you do not have them in your files, you can obtain duplicates from the Secret Service, which did have them and provided some of the receipts you do have. I think you are obliged to. I do request it.

You ask for a copy of the Allen-Scott column referring to the declassification of documents relating to the interception of Oswald's mail. The clearest copy I can make is enclosed. The paragraph under "Letter Intercepted" reads: "An FBI report on file in the National Archives, which has been recently declassified, notes that the agency started its investigation immediately on intercepting Oswald's letter after it was mailed November 18 in Irving, Tex."

The copy I have appeared in the Shreveport, La. "Times" November 20, 1967. Federal origin of the information in this column seems probable. Other parts are relevant also.

On the subject of declassification, at your suggestion I wrote Attorney General Clark last year about those withheld documents in the David Ferrie file that could not properly be withheld, one of which is in my possession and clearly establishes this. Under date of November 7, 1968, Assistant Attorney General Vinson wrote me, "...my periodic review is now (my emphasis) being conducted...We expect this review will be completed in a short time." Therefore, I ask what was declassified and if nothing was, a statement to that effect, a record

If you do not maintain a list of what was restricted and then becomes available, you are severely restricting research, for the volume of material is, as you note, extensive, and it is a physical impossibility to go over the same files again. Also, the bibliography indicates what is withheld and becomes a deception. I would like to think that when a President is murdered, the government does not feel impelled to pinch pennies, to thus interfere with inquiry into it. In the past when I have alleged this archive was understaffed, the Archives assured me this was not the case. If it is not, then there should be a list of what was withheld and is then made available. While I welcome your renewed assurance that you are keeping a list of what I have asked for, I note that after a year I am still without explanation of violation of your own regulations with regard to precisely this and as it relates to me.

5/27/69